

Peer Review

Review of: "The Role of Artificial Intelligence in the Lifecycle of Scientific Manuscripts: Authoring, Reviewing, and Editorial Selection"

Alexandre López-Borrull¹

1. Universitat Oberta de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain

The manuscript offers an ambitious reflection on the integration of artificial intelligence into the lifecycle of scientific manuscripts and has the merit of situating this issue within the broader structural crisis of academic publishing. Its synthesis of recent empirical studies on citation fabrication, together with the systematic comparison between human reviewers and AI systems, provides a relevant and timely evidentiary basis. Particularly noteworthy is the effort to connect technological developments with the political economy of scholarly communication, thereby avoiding a purely instrumental discussion of AI tools.

However, the text occupies an intermediate space that is not fully defined, as it combines elements characteristic of a scoping review with a clearly normative argumentative stance. This hybridity is not inherently problematic, yet it requires methodological clarification, which is currently lacking. If the intention is to present a scoping review, the manuscript should specify at least basic criteria for literature selection, temporal scope, consulted sources, and analytical dimensions. If, alternatively, the purpose is to advance a position paper on the future of peer review, this should be stated explicitly and reflected in the structure of the argument. Without such clarification, the epistemic status of the contribution remains somewhat ambiguous.

In terms of tone, the manuscript adopts a strongly critical orientation, particularly when addressing the potential replacement of human judgment with automated systems. The concerns raised are plausible and often supported by recent evidence, yet in some passages, the argumentation simplifies scenarios that are likely to be more complex in practice. A more explicit engagement with counterarguments, along

with a careful exploration of intermediate and regulated forms of AI integration, would strengthen the analytical robustness of the work and enhance its credibility within a scholarly debate.

The proposed hybrid model, which combines automated technical verification with compensated expert judgment, is coherent and normatively compelling. Nevertheless, it remains largely programmatic. Greater specificity regarding implementation mechanisms, funding pathways, governance structures, and possible indicators for evaluating impact would make the proposal more operational and persuasive. A brief, explicit discussion of the study's limitations would also contribute to reinforcing the manuscript's academic solidity.

Overall, the article constitutes a relevant and timely contribution to ongoing discussions about the governance of artificial intelligence in scholarly communication. To achieve greater academic robustness, it would benefit from a clearer definition of its methodological framework and stated objective, as well as from a deeper engagement with empirical and operational dimensions of the solutions it advocates.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.